arXiv:1203.4853v1 [hep-ph] 21 Mar 2012

A QUASICLASSICAL APPROXIMATION IN THE THEORY OF THE LANDAU—POMERANCHUK EFFECT

A.V. Tarasov, **H.T. Torosyan, and O.O. Voskresenskaya**

Joint Institute for Nuclear Researches, 141980 Dubna, Moscow region, Russia

Abstract. With the use of revised within the quasiclassical approximation the values of parameters of the Moliere multiple scattering theory it is shown that the best agreement of the Migdal theory of the LPM-effect with experiment achieved if to describe the electron-atomic scattering the quasiclassical approximation is used instead of the traditionally used Born one.

1 Introduction

Landau and Pomeranchuk were the first who showed in their works [1], devoted to the research into interaction of ultrarelativistic electrons with a matter, that as a result of the recurrence of multiplicity of electron scattering processes on atomic nuclei there happens the suppression of soft bremsstrahlung.

The effect is connected with the fact that at multiple electron-atomic scattering in a media there occurs a destructive interference of photons emitted at different space points, provided that the formation (coherence) lenght l_{cr} of the bremsstrahlung is small in comparison with the length of a free path of the electron in the medium ($l_{cr} \ll L$, where L is the thickness of a target). The quantitative theory of this phenomenon was created by Migdal [2]. Therefore, it received the name of the Landau—Pomeranchuk—Migdal (LPM) effect.

Effects of such kind should manifest themselves in various systems: in scattering of protons on the nuclei, what has recently been shown in Groning by the AGOR collaboration with the use of the TAPS-spectrometer [3]; penetration of quarks through the nuclear matter at the RHIC and LHC energies [4]. The QCD-analog of the LPM-effect was examined in [5]; opportunity to study the LPM effect in oriented crystal at GeV energy was analyzed in [6]; theoretically, the analog of the LPM-effect was considered for cases of nucleon-nucleon collisions in the neutron stars and supernovae, and also of quark-gluon plasma [4, 7].

The results of a series of experiments at the SLAC [8] and CERN-SPS [9, 10] accelerators on detection of the Landau—Pomeranchuk effect confirmed the basic qualitative conclusion that multiple scattering of the ultrarelativistic charged particles in the matter leads to the suppression of their bremsstrahlung in the soft part of the spectrum.

However, attempts to quantitatively describe of the obtained experimental data [8, 11] faced an unexpected difficulty. For achieving satisfactory agreement with the experiment, the authors [8, 11] had to multiply the results of their calculations by the normalization constant equal to 0.93 [11] $\div$ 0.94 [8], which had no any reasonable explanation.

The next step in the development of the quantitative theory of the LPM-effect was made in the work [12] on the basis of a quasiclassical operator method in QCD. One of the basic equations of this method is the Schrödinger equation in external field with imaginary potential. The equation supposes a formal solution in the form of the path integral [13]. Criticism of the quasiclassical operator approach [14] was denied in [15].

In the given work it is shown that with the use of an improved Moliere theory of multiple scattering [16] in the quasiclassical approach to the description of the electron-atomic scattering, the above divergences [8, 11] between the experiment and the Migdal LPM-effect theory can be overcome. Some results of this work were announced in ref. [17].

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 in the framework of the Migdal theory of the LPM-effect in the small-angle approximation, an expression for the intensity of bremsstrahlung $dI(\omega)/d\omega$ of the electron as it moves in the matter is given, as well as the kinetic equation for the electron distribution function. In Section 3 within the frame of the Fokker-Planck approximation using the results of the Moliere theory, an analytical solution of the equation for $dI(\omega)/d\omega$ at frequency of the emitted photon $\omega \gg \omega_{cr}$ is obtained and the accuracy of the specified approximation is evaluated. On the basis of the obtained solution and exact relation, binding values of the screening angle θ_a of the Moliere theory in the Born and quasiclassical approximations, in the same approximations are calculated values of $(dI(\omega)/d\omega)_{qel}$ and $(dI(\omega)/d\omega)_{Born}$ and rated their relation $R(\omega, L)$ for the case $\omega \gg \omega_{cr}$. Another limiting case $\omega = 0$ is considered. It is shown that the value of $R(\omega, L)$ coincides with the value of the normalization factor of refs. [8, 11] $A \neq A(\omega, L)$, but the latter does not take into account the dependence of this ratio on the quantities ω and L. In Section 4 the brief conclusions are given.

2 Migdal theory of the LPM-effect

Neglecting numerically small quantum-mechanical corrections, we will lead our consideration within the framework of the classical version of the theory of Landau—Pomeranchuk effect, developed in the works of Migdal [2] and Goldman [18].

Using results of [2, 18] and simple, but quite cumbersome calculations, one can receive the following formula for intensity of electron bremsstrahlung averaged on various trajectories of its motion in the media (here and throughout are used the units $\hbar = c = 1$, $e^2 = 1/137$):

$$\frac{dI}{d\omega} = 2\sum_{\vec{\epsilon}}\Big\{ n_0 L \int f^*(\vec{n}_2)\nu(\vec{n}_2 - \vec{n}_1) f(\vec{n}_1) d\vec{n}_1 d\vec{n}_2$$

$$-(n_0 v)^2 \int\limits_0^T dt_1 \int\limits_{t_1}^T dt_2 \; Re\Big[\int f^*(\vec{n}_2)\nu(\vec{n}_2 - \vec{n}_2')\, w(t_2, t_1, \vec{n}_2', \vec{n}_1', \vec{k})$$

$$\times f(\vec{n}_1)\nu(\vec{n}_1' - \vec{n}_1) d\vec{n}_1 d\vec{n}_1' d\vec{n}_2 d\vec{n}_2'\Big]\Big\} \,, \qquad (1)$$

where

$$f(\vec{n}_{1,2}) = \frac{e}{2\pi} \cdot \frac{\vec{\epsilon}\vec{v}_{1,2}}{1 - \vec{n} \cdot \vec{v}_{1,2}} \ ,$$

$$\vec{v}_{1,2} = \nu \cdot \vec{n}_{1,2} \ , \quad \vec{n} = \frac{\vec{k}}{\omega} \ , \quad d\vec{n}_{1,2} \equiv do_{1,2} \ , \quad T = \frac{L}{v} \ ,$$

$$\nu(\vec{n}_2 - \vec{n}_1) = \delta(\vec{n}_2 - \vec{n}_1) \int \sigma_0(\vec{n}_2' - \vec{n}_1) d\vec{n}_2' - \sigma_0(\vec{n}_2 - \vec{n}_1) \ ,$$

$$w(t_2, t_1, \vec{n}_2, \vec{n}_1, \vec{k}) = \int w(t_2, t_1, \vec{r}_2 - \vec{r}_1, \vec{n}_2, \vec{n}_1)$$

$$\times \exp[i\omega(t_2 - t_1) - i\vec{k}(\vec{r}_2 - \vec{r}_1)] d\vec{r}_2 \ .$$

Here, $\vec{k}$, $\vec{\epsilon}$ are the wave-vector and the polarization vector of emitted photon; $\vec{n}_{1,2}$ is the unit vectors in the electron moving direction, v is its rate of speed, which is assumed invariant during the interaction with the target (the quantum-mechanical recoil effect is negligible small), e is its charge; $\sigma_0(\vec{n}_2 - \vec{n}_1) = d\sigma/do_{\vec{n}_2}$ is differential cross-section of electron scattering by target atoms. At last, n_0 is the number of atoms in unit volume media; L is a thickness of the target; $w(t_2, t_1, r_2 - r_1, \vec{n}_2, \vec{n}_1)$ is the electron distribution function in the coordinates $\vec{r}_2$, and the direction of motion $\vec{n}_2$ in time t_2, provided that at time t_1 the electron had the $\vec{r}_1$ coordinate and moved in a direction characterized by the unit vector $\vec{n}_1$.

The distribution function of w satisfies the kinetic equation

$$\frac{\partial w(t_2, t_1, \vec{r}_2 - \vec{r}_1, \vec{n}_2, \vec{n}_1)}{\partial t_2} = -\vec{v}_2 \cdot \vec{\nabla}_{\vec{r}_2} \cdot w(t_2, t_1, \vec{r}_2 - \vec{r}_1, \vec{n}_2, \vec{n}_1)$$

$$- n_0 \int \nu(\vec{n}_2 - \vec{n}_1') w(t_2, t_1, \vec{r}_2 - \vec{r}_1, \vec{n}_2', \vec{n}_1) d\vec{n}_2' \qquad (2)$$

with the boundary condition

$$w(t_2, t_1, \vec{r}_2 - \vec{r}_1, \vec{n}_2, \vec{n}_1)|_{t_2 = t_1} = \delta(\vec{r}_2 - \vec{r}_1)\delta(\vec{n}_2 - \vec{n}_1). \qquad (3)$$

Linear on n_0 term in expression (1) represents “usual” (incoherent) contribution to intensity of the electron bremsstrahlung in media, derived by summation of the radiation intensities of electron interaction with separate atoms of the target.

The quadratic on n_0 term in this expression include the contribution of interference of the bremsstrahlung amplitudes on various atoms. The destructive character of this interference leads to suppression of intensity of the soft radiation, i.e. to the Landau—Pomeranchuka effect.

For ω values, exceeding $\omega_{cr} = 2I/m^2L$, where m is the mass of electron (for estimation of ω_{cr} see [1, 2, 8]), the interference term becomes negligible small, and radiation carries purely incoherent character.

For ultrarelativistic particles ($1 - v \ll 1$) in the formula (1) it is convenient to pass to small-angle approximation [2, 18] according to the scheme

$$\vec{n}_{1,2} = \Big(1 - \frac{\theta_{1,2}^2}{2}\Big)\vec{n} + \vec{\theta}_{1,2}, \quad d\vec{n}_{1,2} = d\vec{\theta}_{1,2} \ ;$$

$$f(\vec{n}_{1,2}) = f(\theta_{1,2}) = \frac{e}{\pi} \cdot \frac{\vec{\epsilon}\vec{\theta}_{1,2}}{\theta_{1,2}^2 + \lambda^2} \ , \quad \lambda = \frac{m}{E} = \gamma^{-1}; \tag{4}$$

$$\sigma_0(\vec{n}_2 - \vec{n}_1) = \sigma_0(\vec{\theta}_2 - \vec{\theta}_1), \quad \delta_0(\vec{n}_2 - \vec{n}_1) = \delta_0(\vec{\theta}_2 - \vec{\theta}_1),$$

$$\nu_0(\vec{n}_2 - \vec{n}_1) = \nu_0(\vec{\theta}_2 - \vec{\theta}_1); \quad w(t_2, t_1, \vec{n}_2, \vec{n}_1, \vec{k}) = w(t_2, t_1, \vec{\theta}_2, \vec{\theta}_1, \omega)$$

and to go on to the Fourier transforms of values f, ν , w:

$$\begin{aligned} f(\vec{\eta}) &= \frac{1}{2\pi} \int f(\vec{\theta}) \exp[i\vec{\eta}\vec{\theta}] d\vec{\theta} = \frac{ie\lambda\vec{\epsilon}\vec{\eta}}{\pi\eta} K_1(\lambda\eta); \\ \nu(\vec{\eta}) &= \int \nu(\vec{\theta}) e^{i\vec{\eta}\vec{\theta}} d\vec{\theta} = 2\pi \int \sigma_0(\theta)[1 - J_0(\eta\theta)]\theta d\theta); \\ w(t_2, t_1, \vec{\eta}_2, \vec{\eta}_1, \omega) &= \frac{1}{(2\pi)^2} \int w(t_2, t_1, \theta_2, \theta_1, \omega) \\ &\times \exp[i\vec{\eta}_2\vec{\theta}_2 - i\vec{\eta}_1\vec{\theta}_1] d\vec{\theta}_1 d\vec{\theta}_2 \ , \end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

where J_0 and K_1 are Bessel and Macdonald functions, accordingly.

Consequently, the expression (1) reduced to the following form:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{dI}{d\omega} &= \frac{2\lambda^2 e^2}{\pi^2} \Big\{ n_0 L \int K_1^2(\lambda\eta)\nu(\eta) d\vec{\eta} \\ &- n_0^2 \int_0^L dt_1 \int_0^L dt_2 \int \frac{(\vec{\eta}_1\vec{\eta}_2)}{\eta_1\eta_2} K_1(\lambda\eta_1) K_1(\lambda\eta_2) \nu(\eta_1)\nu(\eta_2) \\ &\times Re[w(t_2, t_1, \vec{\eta}_2, \vec{\eta}_1, \omega)] d\vec{\eta}_1 d\vec{\eta}_2 \Big\}, \end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

where w satisfies the kinetic equation

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial w(t_2, t_1, \vec{\eta}_2, \vec{\eta}_1, \omega)}{\partial t_2} &= \frac{i\omega}{2} (\lambda^2 - \Delta_{\vec{\eta}_2}) w(t_2, t_1, \vec{\eta}_2, \vec{\eta}_1, \omega) \\ &- n_0 \nu(\vec{\eta}_2) w(t_2, t_1, \vec{\eta}_2, \vec{\eta}_1, \omega) \end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

with the boundary condition

$$w(t_1, t_1, \vec{\eta}_2, \vec{\eta}_1, \omega) = \delta(\vec{\eta}_2 - \vec{\eta}_1). \tag{8}$$

The form of the equation (7) is similar in appearance to the equation for the Green's function of the two-dimensional Schrödinger equation with the mass ω^{-1} and the complex potential

$$U(\eta) = -\frac{\omega\lambda^2}{2} - i\eta_0\nu(\eta) \tag{9}$$

and therefore admits a formal solution in the form of a continual integral (see, e.g., [19]).

3 Quasiclassical approximation of the Moliere theory within the theory of the LPM-effect

The analytical solution of the equation (7) at arbitrary values of ω only within the Fokker—Plank approximation is possible:[*]

$$\nu(\eta) = a \cdot \eta^2, \tag{10}$$

but at $\omega = 0$ it's possible also for arbitrary $\nu(\eta)$.

In the latter case ($\omega = 0$)

$$w(t_2, t_1, \vec{\eta}_2, \vec{\eta}_1, 0) = \delta(\vec{\eta}_2 - \vec{\eta}_1) exp[-n_0 \nu(\eta_2)(t_2 - t_1)] \ , \tag{11}$$

and integration on $t_1, \ t_2$ in (6) is carried out trivially, leading to the following simple result:

$$\frac{dI(\omega)}{d\omega}\bigg|_{\omega=0} = \frac{4\lambda^2 e^2}{\pi} \int K_1^2(\lambda\eta)(1 - \exp[-n_0\nu(\eta)L)]\eta d\eta. \tag{12}$$

In the other limiting case ($\omega \gg \omega_{cr}$), taking into account the mentioned above, we get:

$$\frac{dI(\omega)}{d\omega}\bigg|_{\omega\gg\omega_{cr}} = n_0 L \lambda^2 e^2 \int K_1^2(\lambda\eta)\nu(\eta)\eta d\eta. \tag{13}$$

Due to the properties of Macdonald functions, the main contribution to the integrals (12), (13) brings the area $0 \leq \eta \leq 1/\lambda$. As was shown in classical works of Moliere [20] on the theory of multiple scattering of the charged particles in medium, the magnitude $\nu(\eta)$ in this area can be derived in the following way:

$$\nu(\eta) = \frac{2\pi(Z\alpha)^2\lambda^2\eta^2}{m^2}\left[\ln\frac{2}{\eta\theta_a} - C + \frac{1}{2}\right] \ , \tag{14}$$

where C is Euler's constant, and the θ_a, called as "a screening angle", depends both on screening properties of atom, and on $\sigma_0(\theta)$-approximation used for its calculation.

Using the Thomas-Fermi model of atom [21], Moliere received θ_a for the cases when the σ_0 is calculated on the Born or quasiclassical approximations:

$$(\theta_a)_{Born} = 1.2 \cdot \lambda \cdot \alpha \cdot Z^{1/3}, \tag{15}$$

$$(\theta_a)_{qcl} = 1.2 \cdot \lambda \cdot \alpha \cdot Z^{1/3}\sqrt{1 + 3.56 \cdot (Z\alpha)^2}. \tag{16}$$

The latter result has an approximate character (critical remarks to his conclusion see in the V.T. Scott review [22]).

Using the technique developed in [23], it is possible to show [16] that for any model of atom can be derived:

$$\ln\left[(\theta_a)_{qcl}\right] = \ln\left[(\theta_a)_{Born}\right] + Re[\psi(1 - iZ\alpha)] + C \ , \tag{17}$$

---

[*] An explicit expression for w, received in this approach, can be found in [18].

where ψ is a logarithmic derivative of Γ-function.

After the substitution of $\nu(\eta)$ as a (14) in expression (13), the integration is carried out analytically, leading to the following result:

$$\frac{dI(\omega)}{d\omega}\Big|_{\omega\gg\omega_{cr}} = \frac{16}{3}\Big(\frac{Z\alpha^2}{m}\Big)^2\cdot\Big(\ln\frac{\lambda}{\theta_a}+\frac{7}{12}\Big)n_0\cdot L\ . \tag{18}$$

Substituting here the numerical values of parameter θ_a from (15) and (17), corresponding to $Z = 79$, and putting the ratio

$$R(\omega) = \frac{\Big[\frac{dI(\omega)}{d\omega}\Big]_{qcl}}{\Big[\frac{dI(\omega)}{d\omega}\Big]_{Born}}\quad , \tag{19}$$

we get

$$R(\omega)|_{\omega\gg\omega_{cr}} = 0.922,$$

which is practically coincides with the magnitude of the normalizing factor $0.93 \div 0.94$, place in operation by the authors [8, 11] for achieving agreement of calculus for σ_0 in the Born approximation with the experiment. †

In other limiting case ($\omega = 0$) the performance of numerical integration in (12), we get the following result for three case of thickness of a target in the experiment [8]:

$$R(\omega)|_{\omega=0} = \begin{cases} 0.936, & L = 0.001X_0 \\ 0.961, & L = 0.007X_0 \\ 0.982, & L = 0.060X_0 \end{cases}\quad , \tag{20}$$

where $X_0 \approx 0.33$ cm is the radiation length of the target media ($Z = 79$). From general considerations, it is obvious that at $0 < \omega < \omega_{cr}$

$$R(\omega)|_{\omega\gg\omega_{cr}} \le R(\omega) \le R(\omega)|_{\omega=0}\ . \tag{21}$$

At last, let us discuss briefly the accuracy of the Fokker—Plank approximation, that allows to receive analytical expression of w_0 and calculate simply the all spectrum of $dI(\omega)/d\omega$ (using numerical calculation of triple integrals).

To do that, we will fixed the parameter a in expression (14) in a way, bringing to the coincidence of the results of the exact calculation of the $(dI(\omega)/d\omega)|_{\omega\gg\omega_{cr}}$ and its calculation in the Fokker—Plank approximation. So we get for the a:

$$a = 2\pi\Big(\frac{Z\alpha\sigma}{m}\Big)^2\Big[\ln\frac{\sigma}{\theta_a}+\frac{7}{12}\Big]. \tag{22}$$

Now we use to calculate $(dI(\omega)/d\omega)|_{\omega=0}$ the relations (20) and (21) and compare the received result with the result received using the "realistic" (Moliere) expression (14) for $\nu(\eta)$. Then for the relation

$$\bar{R} = \frac{\Big[\frac{dI(\omega)}{d\omega}|_{\omega=0}\Big]_{FP}}{\Big[\frac{dI(\omega)}{d\omega}|_{\omega=0}\Big]_{M}} \tag{23}$$

---

† The use of an approximate result of Moliere (16) for $(\theta_a)_{qcl}$ would result in the magnitude $R(\omega)|_{\omega\gg\omega_{cr}} = 0.900$.

we get the following values:

$$\bar{R} = \begin{cases} 0.947, & L = 0.001X_0 \\ 0.890, & L = 0.007X_0 \\ 0.872, & L = 0.060X_0 \end{cases} . \tag{24}$$

It is obvious that the difference of magnitude of (24) from the unit is distinctly more than an characteristic experimental error. Therefore it is clear, that the use of the Fokker—Plank approximation can be used only for the qualitative description of the behavior of $dI(\omega)/d\omega$ value. For carrying out the accurate quantitative analysis it is necessary to use the magnitude of w, received by the numerical solution of the kinetic equation (7). Results of such analysis, together with detailed comparison of the experimental data, will form a separate article.

4 Conclusion

In the given work, considering the fact that in calculations for the description of the interaction processes of electrons with the atoms of a gold target ($Z\alpha \sim 0.6$), the authors [8, 11] used the Born approximation, it became possible to show that the above pointed discrepancy between the theory and the experiment can be explained not only qualitatively, but also quantitatively, if the corrections to the results of the Born approximation are correctly taken into account. From (20), (21) it follows that, the results of the quasi-classical approach for $dI/d\omega$ cannot be derived from the results of the Born approximation for this quantity by multiplying by the normalization factor which is independent from the values of the frequency ω and thickness of the target L. However, taking into account nearly 3% error of experimental data [8], it is possible to understand, why the procedure of multiplying by the normalization factor described above, helped the authors [8, 11] to conform the calculations in the Born approximation with the experimental data.

References

[1] L.D. Landau and I.Ya. Pomeranchuk, Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR, **92**, 535 (1953); **92**, 735 (1953) [Translated into English: in The Collected Papers of L. D. Landau, New-York: Pergamon Press, 1965, p. 589);
E.L. Feinberg and I.Ya. Pomeranchuk, Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR, **93**, 439 (1953); Nuovo Cim. Suppl., **4**, 652 (1956);
I.Ya. Pomeranchuk, Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR, **96**, 265 (1954); **96**, 481 (1954).

[2] A.B. Migdal, Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR, **96**, 49 (1954); Phys. Rev. **103**, 1811 (1956).

[3] M.J. van Goethem, L. Aphecetche, J.C.S. Bacelar et al. Phys. Rev. Lett., **88**, 122302 (2002).

[4] B.Z. Kopeliovich, A. Schäfer, and A.V. Tarasov, Phys. Rev., **C 59**, 1609 (1999).

[5] M. Gyulassy and X.-N. Wang, Nucl. Phys., **B 420**, 583 (1994); M. Gyulassy, P. Levai, and I. Vitev, Nucl. Phys., **B 594**, 371 (2001);
R. Baier et al., Phys. Lett., **B 345**, 277 (1995); Nucl. Phys., **B 483**, 291 (1997); **531**, 403 (1998); Phys. Rev., **C 58**, 1706 (1998);
B.G. Zakharov, Phys. At. Nucl., **61**, 838 (1998); JETP Lett., **65**, 615 (1997); **70**, 176 (1999); **73**, 49 (2001).

[6] V.N. Baier and V.M. Katkov, Phys. Lett., **A 353**, 91 (2006); arXiv:0711.3670 [hep-ph] (2007).

[7] S. Peignè and A.V. Smilga, Uspekhi Fizicheskikh Nauk **179**, 697 (2009).

[8] P.L. Anthony, R. Becker-Szendy, P.E. Bosted et al., Phys. Rev. Lett., **75**, 1949 (1995); **76**, 3550 (1996); Phys. Rev., **D56**, 1373 (1997).

[9] H.D. Hansen, U.I. Uggerhoj , C. Biino et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. **91**, 014801 (2003); Phys. Rev. **D69**, 032001 (2004).

[10] J.U. Andersen, K. Kirsebom, S.P. Moller et al, Electromagnetic Processes in Strong Cristalline Fields, CERN-SPSC-2005-030; CERN-NA63 Collaboration, Phys.Lett., **B 672**, 323 (2009); Nucl. Instrum. Meth., **B 268**, 1412 (2010).

[11] B.G. Zakharov, JETP Lett., **64**, 781 (1996).

[12] V.N. Baier, V.M. Katkov, and V.M.Strakhovenko, Sov. Phys. JETP, **67**, 70 (1988).

[13] R. Blancenbeckler and S.D. Drell, Phys.Rev., **D53**, 6265 (1996).

[14] B.G. Zakharov, arXiv:hep-ph/9908449 (1999).

[15] V.N. Baier and V.M. Katkov, arXiv:hep-ph/10202 (1999).

[16] L. Afanasyev and A. Tarasov, in: G. Gasser, A. Rusetsky and J. Schacher (Eds.), Proc. Int. Workshop on Hadronic Atoms, ECT-04-01, HISKP-TH-04/02, Trento – Bonn, 2004, p. 12 [arXiv:hep-ph/0401204]; S. Bakmaev, A. Tarasov, and O. Voskresenskaya, in: L. Afanasyev, G. Colangelo and J. Schacher (Eds.), Proc. Int. Workshop on Hadronic Atoms, Bern – CERN, 2005, arXiv:hep-ph/0508193; L. Afanasyev, A. Tarasov, and O. Voskresenskaya, in preparation.

[17] O.O. Voskresenskaya, A.N. Sisakian, A.V. Tarasov, and G.T. Torosian, Preprint JINR P2-97-308, Dubna, 1997 (in Russian).

[18] I.I. Goldman, Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz., **38**, 1866 (1960).

[19] R.P. Feynman and A.R. Hibbs, Quantum mechanics and path integrals, New York: McGrav-Hill, 1965.

[20] G. Molière, Z. Naturforsch., **2A**, 133 (1947); **3A**, 78 (1948); **10A**, 177 (1955).

[21] L.D. Landau and E.M. Lifshitz, Quantum Mechanics, Moscow: Nauka Publication, 1974.

[22] W.T. Scott, Rev. Mod. Phys., **35**, 231 (1963).

[23] O.O. Voskresenskaya, S.R. Gevorkyan, and A.V. Tarasov, Phys. Atom. Nucl., **61**, 1517 (1998); O.O. Voskresenskaya, Thesis, Dubna, JINR, 2003.